

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 4-6, 22-26, and new Claims 39-53 in view of the following arguments are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §102

The rejection of Claims 1-6 and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Harari, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,887,145; hereafter “Harari”) has been maintained. The Applicant respectfully maintains the traversal to the rejection as well as the request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Harari relates to a personal computer (“PC”) card having a PCMCIA form-factor PC mother card portion (col. 6, lines 63-67), which can be mated with an EEPROM memory chip daughter card (col. 7, lines 4-6 and 31-32).

In response to the counter-arguments provided on page 3 of the outstanding Office Action, Claim 1 has been amended to recite an assembly comprising “a device physically sized in a form factor of a PCMCIA card, the device having an interface to communicate with a storage card and a flash memory to store user data.” The claimed assembly has been further amended to comprise “a removable smart card associated with a user that alternately enables access to the user data on the memory when interfaced with the device interface and disables access to the user data when removed from the device.”

Harari fails to anticipate the claimed invention by failing to teach each and every feature of the amended claim, as required by MPEP 2131. More specifically, the rejection cites the mother card 10 (Fig. 1) as being a PCMCIA form-factor PC card having an interface to communicate with storage card 20. However, mother card 14 does not have a flash memory to store user data, which

1 is acknowledged as follows, “The mother card 10 contains a memory controller 40
2 but does not contain any substantial amount of flash EEPROM mass storage,”
3 (col. 7, lines 37-39). Rather, it is daughter card 20 that “contains essentially flash
4 EEPROM memory chip(s) 30,” (col. 7, lines 31-32), and further Harari is silent
5 regarding the inclusion of any such memory in the reference apparatus.

6 Independent Claim 22 recites a computer system comprising “a computer
7 having a PCMCIA device reader,” and “a smart card secured memory physically
8 sized in a form factor of a PCMCIA card to compatibly interface with the
9 PCMCIA device reader in the computer, the smart card secured memory assembly
10 having data memory to store user data and a removable smart card that alternately
11 enables access to the user data when present and disables access to the user data
12 when removed.” Applicants submit that, for reasons similar to those discussed
13 above regarding independent Claim 1, Harari fails to anticipate Claim 22 and
14 corresponding dependent Claims 23-26.

15 It is respectfully submitted that, for at least the reasons set forth above, the
16 proposed reference fails to teach all of the features presently claimed, and thus the
17 rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn.

18

19 **Conclusion**

20 The remaining references of record have been studied. It is respectfully
21 submitted that they do not compensate for the deficiencies of the reference
22 discussed above with regards to the rejected claims, as well as new Claims 39-53.

23 All rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that all of
24 Claims 1, 4-6, 22-26 and 39-53 are in condition for allowance. Early and
25 forthright issuance of a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If any issues

1 remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact
2 the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

3

4

5

6 Dated: 10/17/03

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Allan S. Spanseller (Reg. No. 38,318) for:
David S. Lee
Reg. No. 38,222
(425) 844-0791